

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

July 30, 2018

Before

Frank H. Easterbrook, *Circuit Judge*
Ilana Diamond Rovner, *Circuit Judge*
David D. Hamilton, *Circuit Judge*

CERTIFIED COPY

A True Copy

Teste:


Deputy Clerk
of the United States
Court of Appeals for the
Seventh Circuit

JOE LOUIS LAWRENCE,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

No. 18-2305 v.

420 E. OHIO, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

] Appeal from the United
] States District Court for
] the Northern District of
] Illinois, Eastern Division.
]
] No. 1:16-cv-07434
]
] Robert M. Dow, Jr.,
] Judge.

ORDER

On consideration of the papers filed in this appeal and review of the short record,

IT IS ORDERED that this appeal is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction.

Rule 3(c)(1)(B) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure requires a notice of appeal to “designate the judgment, order, or part thereof being appealed.” In addition, Rule 4(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure requires that a notice of appeal in a civil case be filed in the district court within 30 days of the entry of the judgment or order appealed. Appellant Joe Louis Lawrence’s notice of appeal fails to comply with both rules.

First, we note that appellant Lawrence’s case was dismissed nearly two years ago, and appellant Lawrence’s appeal from that judgment was dismissed for failure to pay the appellate filing fee. *See* Appeal No. 16-3972 (dismissed on November 21, 2016). The present notice of appeal does not identify any order that appellant Lawrence wants this court to review. But, we note that the notice of appeal was filed on June 11, 2018, and therefore is three days late as to the district court’s most recent order of May 9, 2018 (denying reconsideration of a May 2, 2018 order) – the 30th day after entry of the May 9,

2018 order was Friday, June 8, 2018. The notice of appeal, of course, is untimely as to two other orders issued in calendar year 2018 – one entered on April 4, 2018 and the other entered on May 2, 2018. The district court has not granted an extension of the appeal period, *see* Rule 4(a)(5), and this court is not empowered to do so, *see* Fed. R. App. P. 26(b).